
LEGISLATION AND POLICY

Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request for Foreign Operations

By

Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary of State

[The following testimony was presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, 13 April 2000 in Washington, D.C.]

My message is straightforward. I ask you to fully fund the foreign operations portion of the President's national security budget request. I do so knowing that this Subcommittee more than most is comprised of men and women who understand the complex demands of leadership in our era. You know that, more and more, events overseas have an impact on our citizens here at home, on our security, our jobs, our environment, even the safety of our streets and schools.

And you know that, because America has led for so long, through Republican and Democratic administrations alike, our nation was able to enter the new century strong and respected, prosperous and at peace.

The President's Fiscal Year 2001 request for Foreign Operations is \$15.09 billion as part of a total international affairs budget of roughly \$22.75 billion. This includes a broad array of programs and initiatives administered by four cabinet departments and more than a dozen agencies. It covers everything from supporting peace in the Middle East to interdicting drugs; from curbing the spread of nuclear weapons to the Peace Corps; and from promoting U.S. exports to responding to humanitarian disasters.

The amount requested by the President is our best estimate of what we will absolutely need next year. But the truth is that unforeseen events occur, and it is simply not possible to anticipate every need a year or more in advance as the budget process requires.

As you know, in 1999, we had to come back to Congress for supplemental appropriations to aid in hurricane response in Central America and the Caribbean, and to help implement the Wye Memorandum in support of Middle East peace.

This year, the President is seeking your support for emergency funds to help stem the flow of narcotics from the Andes, bolster democracy in Southeast Europe, and keep the peace in Kosovo and East Timor. These investments are urgently needed.

For example, in Colombia, President Andres Pastrana merits our support for his plan to fight drug trafficking, achieve peace, promote prosperity and improve governance throughout his country. The United States has a profound interest in helping Colombians to achieve these closely-linked goals. New production methods and expanded cultivation have caused a sharp increase in illicit narcotics production in Colombia. Today, more than four-fifths of the cocaine

entering our nation either comes from that country or is transported through it. And most of Colombia's heroin production is exported to the United States.

The emergency aid President Clinton has requested will help Bogota gain control over parts of the country where drugs are produced and which are now dominated by illegal armed groups that engage in, or protect, drug trafficking. It will support alternative development programs, increase our backing for narcotics interdiction, and strengthen mechanisms for judicial reform, human rights and humanitarian assistance. Recognizing that neither criminals nor conflicts respect national borders, the President's request will also support counter-drug initiatives in other Andean countries. Only Colombians can devise a solution for Colombia's ills. President Pastrana has put forward a bold plan for doing just that. It is urgent that we support him.

The requirement for supplemental funding to address instability in the Balkans is equally pressing. Throughout this region, the struggle between violent extremists and more moderate and democratic elements is taking place in real time. We are at a pivotal point in Kosovo, where respected Serb leaders have agreed to participate in meetings of the U.N.'s Joint Interim Administrative Council. In Montenegro, President Djukanovic is being pressed hard by the Milosevic regime. Within Serbia, democratic forces are striving to open more political space, and build the institutions of an independent civil society. And in Croatia, a new and democratic government is struggling to respond to economic crisis.

With support from many in both parties in Congress, we have worked hard to support stability and democratic growth throughout Southeast Europe. This is in our interests, because we know from history that the United States cannot be secure if Europe is not secure, and that Europe will be at risk as long as its southeast corner is plagued by conflict.

We have also worked hard to assure that our European partners would provide the lion's share of reconstruction and other assistance to this region. They are stepping up to the task. But we will not be successful in leveraging the help of others, or in protecting our own interests, without support for the President's emergency supplemental funding requests. These requests also include funds needed to pay our share of U.N. peace missions in Kosovo and East Timor.

As you know, the House has approved an emergency supplemental appropriations bill, although it failed to include some important elements of the President's requests. I hope we will be able to work with the Senate leadership and members of this Committee to remedy those deficiencies and move ahead soon on this very vital legislation. As we respond to these immediate needs, Mr. Chairman, we must also consider requirements for FY2001, the first full year of the new century. And to me, the most salient characteristic of our budget request for the coming year is its modesty.

Most Americans are astonished when I tell them that we devote a smaller percentage of our wealth to assisting overseas development than any other industrialized country. Over the past decade, our rate of investment has declined by fifty percent. Half a century ago, in the era of Truman and Marshall, our international affairs programs, in relative terms, were more than ten times larger than today.

All this has consequences. It reduces our influence for stability and peace in potentially explosive regions. It detracts from our leadership on global economic issues. It makes it harder for us to leverage the help of others. And it often leaves us with a no-win choice between devoting resources to one emergency and using those same resources to deal with another urgent need.

That is why it is so important that you support the President's full international affairs request. I emphasize this because we truly are talking about the minimum amount we need. If you reduce our request, you will reduce our capacity to lead. I say this with the clear understanding that the vast majority of the funds I seek will be spent next year, under a new administration. My request has nothing to do with parties or personalities; it has everything to do with our nation's ability to protect our interests, promote our values and meet our priorities.

Accordingly, I am very concerned about the FY2001 budget resolution that is in the final stages of congressional consideration. A proposal has been made to slash funding for the international affairs function by more than \$2 billion from the President's budget. This would destroy the options of this Subcommittee and take a meat axe to America's capacity to lead. I urge you to do all you can to shape a budget resolution that is in keeping with America's global responsibilities, and that would enable us to provide the kind of effective foreign policy our citizens deserve and our interests demand.

I would like to review some of the priorities of our foreign policy, with emphasis on the direct benefits our citizens derive from the work we do. First, our international programs help make Americans more secure. The Cold War is over and our nation is strong, but our citizens continue to face grave dangers. These include terrorists who target Americans, possible conflicts in key regions, drug traffickers, and the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles that can deliver them. In many cases, we cannot defend against these threats simply by acting alone. We need the help of others. Nor is force always the best approach. On many occasions, we will rely on diplomacy as our first line of defense to cement alliances, build coalitions, and find ways to protect our interests without putting our fighting men and women at risk.

An example is our effort to protect Americans from the threat posed by nuclear weapons. Here, the military deterrent provided by our armed forces and the technological edge they enjoy are indispensable. But we will sleep better and be safer if our deterrent never has to be used. The job for our diplomats, then, is to create a political environment in which serious military threats to our country are less likely to arise.

To this end, the United States has led in establishing an international legal framework centered on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, IAEA safeguards, the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions, and now the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction from spreading or falling into the wrong hands.

Moreover, our Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) has done much to protect the American people, destroying almost 5000 nuclear warheads in the former Soviet Union; eliminating nuclear weapons from three former Soviet republics; and engaging 30,000 former Soviet weapons scientists in peaceful ventures. The President is requesting \$974 million for ETRI in FY2001, including \$141 million for programs administered by the Department of State.

We are also taking steps to protect ourselves from the new threats posed by ballistic missiles. On the Korean Peninsula, we have reviewed our policy over the past year in close coordination with Seoul and our indispensable ally Japan. We are backing President Kim Dae-jung's strategy of dialogue with the Democratic Republic of North Korea (DPRK), including plans for a historic summit between leaders from the North and South in June.

We have also expressed a willingness to improve our own relations with Pyongyang while it addresses our key concerns. Last September, we reached an understanding with the North that it will refrain from any long-range missile flight tests as long as negotiations to improve relations that are underway. Last month, the DPRK committed to hold a new round of missile talks and to

initiate discussions that would address our concerns on nuclear weapons issues. The DPRK also confirmed that it will provide access once again to Kumchang-ni which we plan to visit in May.

The DPRK's nuclear weapons-associated activities are another area of deep concern. By freezing the North's nuclear facilities at Yongbyon and Taechon, which pose a serious proliferation risk, the Agreed Framework is making a vital contribution to stability. We need Congressional support for meeting our obligations under the Framework, just as we expect the DPRK to meet its own.

We also need your help in safeguarding Americans from other dangers. Today, when America's military is called upon to act, we often do so as part of a coalition. This reflects the value of our security assistance programs, including International Military Education and Training. These programs contribute to America's defense industrial base, take advantage of opportunities to promote democratic practices, and help friends and allies to develop armed forces that are more capable and better able to operate with our own.

In this connection, I am pleased to report that we are developing a proposal to enhance Egypt's Foreign Military Financing that we believe is responsive both to the Egyptian military modernization program and our own budget constraints. The directed disbursement proposal is being readied for submission to Congress now and we will want to discuss it with you shortly.

A similar rationale underlies our voluntary contributions to international peacekeeping activities. After all, if we do not want America's military deployed in more and more hot spots abroad, we should do all we can to enhance the capacity of others to end conflicts and build peace. Another area where resources are required to protect our interests is in responding to the threat posed by international terror. Because of our military strength, potential enemies may try to attack us by unconventional means, including terrorist strikes and the possible use of chemical or biological weapons. Although the number of terrorist strikes has declined in recent years, the severity of such strikes has increased.

In countering these threats, we must be prepared at home and overseas. That is why we are taking strong security measures and at President Clinton's direction, improving our planning for emergency response. Through our diplomacy and training programs, we help friendly governments to improve border security and share information about those suspected of being affiliated with terrorist networks. We gather information to advise and warn Americans. We strive to forge international agreements and cooperation that will leave terrorists with no place to run, hide, operate or stash their assets. We do all we can to bring suspects before the bar of justice, as we have in several major cases, including the sabotage of Pan Am 103, and the tragic 1998 bombing of two U.S. embassies in Africa.

This year, we are proposing in the President's budget the creation of a dedicated center for antiterrorism and security training. This center will help us to improve the skills of foreign security personnel who are on the front line of defense at airports, diplomatic missions and other facilities frequented by Americans overseas. We believe this center should be located in the Washington, D.C. area, in order to foster interaction between the foreign security officials we train and our own security and law enforcement personnel. This will also enable us to consolidate our training programs, thereby streamlining management and improving the environment for training.

American security also depends on our ability to fight and win the struggle against international crime. Drug cartels and criminal syndicates have expanded their operations since the end of the Cold War, in part by capitalizing on the same technological advances that have fueled legitimate international commerce. Recognizing the seriousness of this threat, President Clinton

has launched a comprehensive effort to integrate all facets of the federal response to international crime. The State Department is a key partner in this initiative.

We are working with other nations around the globe to strengthen legal codes; train police, prosecutors and judges; close criminal front companies; halt illegal smuggling and money laundering; negotiate extradition treaties; and bring criminals to justice. We are also pursuing a comprehensive strategy to fight illegal trafficking in narcotics. This includes support for eradication, interdiction, alternative development, seizing drug assets and extraditing drug kingpins to the United States for trial.

These efforts are paying healthy dividends. Last year our programs helped prevent a potential 135 tons of cocaine with a street value of more than \$23 billion from reaching American neighborhoods. We have helped to substantially reduce opium production in Thailand and end it entirely in Guatemala; cut coca production dramatically in Bolivia and Peru; and worked with foreign governments to break up transnational drug organizations.

A second overarching goal of our foreign policy is to support American prosperity by promoting a healthy world economy and by ensuring fair treatment for American businesses, farmers, ranchers and workers. With this goal in mind, the President has asked Congress to support the Administration's agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization by passing Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR). The arguments in favor of PNTR are clear and compelling.

As President Clinton put it, "Economically, this agreement is the equivalent of a one-way street." It will dramatically cut import barriers imposed on American goods and services, without requiring us to change any of our own current market access policies. We preserve our right to withdraw market access in the event of a national security emergency. We make no changes in laws controlling the export of sensitive technology. And our protections against unfair trade practices and potential import surges are stronger with the agreement than without it. Conversely, if we do not enact PNTR for China, the United States will risk losing most of the market access benefits of the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement. China will join the WTO anyway. And our competitors in Europe, Asia and elsewhere will reap the benefits from the agreement we negotiated. So a vote against PNTR would simply be shooting ourselves in the foot. It would cost America jobs, not protect them.

Some critics suggest that U.S. concerns about China's human rights record should be expressed by denying normal relations on trade. But that approach would undercut the positive forces that are now at work in China. The WTO accession will require China to follow international trading rules and reduce the role of state-owned enterprises. This will help promote the rule of law and spur the development of a more open society. Others suggest that the United States should not grant PNTR to China until there is clear improvement in Beijing's relations with Taipei. But this ignores the strong support Taiwan authorities have expressed for China's entry into the WTO, and President-elect Chen's public support for normal trade relations between China and the United States.

From the standpoint of our national security, President Clinton's proposal for according PNTR to China is a plus. The combination of PNTR and WTO accession will give China more reasons to be prudent in its handling of the Taiwan issue. China and Taiwan in the WTO together will be able to develop a deeper and rule-based economic relationship. The stronger its economic relations across the Strait and with the U.S., the more China has to gain from cooperation and a peaceful resolution of differences.

Conversely, China would see a rejection of PNTR as a strategic decision by the United States to turn from cooperation to confrontation, and to deal with China as an adversary. This outcome would not serve our interests. Denying PNTR would drive the Chinese away from integration into the international community and its standards. This is the wrong direction. We want China to move in the right direction, towards increased cooperation on tough security issues such as South Asia, Korean stability and nonproliferation. In recent years, we have made considerable progress on these issues. A vote for PNTR is a vote for encouraging China to do more.

As we pursue trade with China, the State Department is also working to strengthen the global network of financial, legal, and other arrangements upon which virtually all international business transactions depend. This is especially important for leading edge sectors such as internet commerce and parts of the telecommunications industry. For example, in the last two years we have ensured that the most lucrative e-commerce markets estimated to be worth more than \$1 trillion by 2003, are taxed without discrimination or costly customs duties. And we won the European Union's agreement not to discriminate against American cellphones.

More traditional industries also benefit. In recent years, we have negotiated 35 civil aviation agreements in support of an industry that employs more than 600,000 of our citizens. These agreements also help cities that are now international destinations. Memphis has recently attracted dozens of new businesses because Federal Express has expanded, and Chicago's O'Hare Airport is expected to attract \$1 billion in new regional investment because of our new aviation agreement with Japan.

Of course, many of America's fastest growing markets are in developing countries where the transition to an open economic system is incomplete. Often these countries are held back by high rates of population growth, lack of access to health care and education, and civil strife. So there is still a vital need for development assistance and for organizations such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), especially in the poorer nations of Africa and Asia.

For years, UNDP has been at the forefront of helping developing countries establish democratic institutions, market economies and basic human rights. It also plays a major role in supporting women worldwide as they strive to gain more equal access to the levers of political and economic power.

Like UNDP, UNICEF plays an important role in countries suffering or recovering from the devastation caused by civil or international conflict. Around the world, UNICEF helps protect children a society's most vulnerable members and its hope for the future. President Clinton has proposed a new tax credit to speed the development of vaccines for killer infectious diseases including malaria, tuberculosis and AIDS that disproportionately afflict developing nations. And we are asking for an increase of \$150 million, much of it from this Subcommittee, in our worldwide fight against these diseases. I urge your support for these requests.

I also ask your support for our initiative in partnership with the G-8 to provide debt relief for the most heavily indebted poor countries, and to use a portion of that relief to improve basic education and health care and conserve the environment.

And I urge you to restore full funding to our support for international family planning. This is the most effective way for us to reduce the number of abortions and make it more likely that when children are born, they grow up healthy and strong. The money for these programs should be provided without restrictions on free speech or that might hamper efforts to save lives and protect the health of women and children.

A third major objective of our international affairs programs is to support peace. We know from history that unresolved disputes can erupt into violence that endangers allies, creates economic havoc, generates refugees and entangles our own forces in combat. So we have a strong national interest in helping others, especially in key regions, to settle their differences at the bargaining table, rather than the battlefield.

Today, in the Middle East, we need steady congressional backing as we work with the parties to find the road to a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement. As we have seen so often in recent weeks, the legacy of mistrust in the region is hard to overcome and the enemies of peace remain active. But never before has the logic of peace been so compelling or the opportunity for peace so clear. At this critical time, America's commitment to progress on all tracks, and our appropriate support for those willing to take risks for peace, must remain rock solid.

In Sierra Leone, we are supporting efforts through the United Nations to back the peace process and enable the people of that devastated country to begin to recover and rebuild. Success will depend greatly on whether the United States and other U.N. members sustain their commitments.

In the Congo, the Lusaka Agreement provides a good basis for ending the war, and we have challenged its signatories to live up to their obligations under it. The signatories have also agreed to provide access, security and cooperation to a United Nations peace mission. Such a mission cannot impose a solution, but it can help give the parties the confidence they need to implement one.

Meanwhile, through the African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), we have trained over 5,000 troops from seven African countries to respond quickly and effectively to peacekeeping challenges. Some of these soldiers are already participating in peacekeeping operations, and starting in September we will expand the training from battalion level to include brigade headquarters programs as well.

In Southeast Europe, in partnership with the European Union and others, we have entered into a multi-year strategy for integrating the nations of that region into the continent's democratic mainstream. The goals of this Southeast Europe Stability Pact are to foster peaceful, tolerant societies; build viable economies; and transform the region from a source of instability into a full participant and partner in the new Europe.

We are under no illusions about the difficulty of this task. It is literally to alter the patterns of history, to replace whirlpools of violence leading nowhere with a steady upward tide. This won't happen unless the international community follows through on commitments to help. And unless regional leaders make the hard choices required to create societies based on freedom and law.

Accordingly, we welcome the commitments made by international donors (including international financial institutions) at the Brussels Conference two weeks ago of about \$6.1 billion in year 2000 funds for the region with \$2.28 billion front-loaded for specific quick start regional projects. Our allies are pulling their weight on these initiatives, and the U.S. share announced at the conference was \$624 million.

Governments in the region are also doing their part by taking steps to curb corruption and create a good climate for doing business. We are particularly heartened by democratic progress in the former Yugoslavia. The recent elections in Croatia were a true breakthrough, representing a triumph for civil society and a major turning point away from ultra-nationalism and towards democratic values.

In Bosnia, since the Dayton Accords were signed, free and fair elections have been held at all levels. President Djukanovic is committed to democratic practices in Montenegro. And increasingly in Serbia, people are asking when they will be given the right so many of their neighbors have to choose their leaders freely and without fear.

In Kosovo, our challenge is to prepare the way for democracy by bringing the same determination to the task of building stability as we did to ending conflict. In less than ten months, much progress has been made. Large-scale violence has ended. Almost a million refugees and displaced have returned home. Nevertheless, the situation remains tense and unpredictable. Backed by Kosovo's leaders, we have urged citizens to refrain from violence, and to cooperate with KFOR, the U.N. mission, and the international war crimes tribunal. And we are working with the citizens of Kosovo to prepare for municipal elections later this year.

The President's FY2000 supplemental and FY2001 budget requests include our share of funds to help Kosovo build a democratic society. Combined with the far larger contributions received from our allies and partners, these funds will be used to help create effective civil administration, spur economic activity, create democratic institutions and train and equip an effective police force.

A fourth purpose of our international affairs programs is to promote values that reflect the interests, character and ideals of the American people.

We do this because it is right, but also because it is smart. Compared to dictatorships, democratic nations are more likely to be stable, better able to cope with financial stress, more reliable trading partners and less likely to generate refugees or contribute to other global problems. Nations that respect the rights of their own citizens are also more likely to respect the rights of other countries. And because America has interests in every corner of the globe, we benefit when those interests are protected by legal systems that are independent and fair.

One hundred years ago, the number of countries with a government elected competitively and on the basis of universal suffrage was zero. Today, according to *Freedom House*, it is 120. These include countries on every continent, and people of virtually every culture and faith.

Over the past half-century, we have seen nation after nation gain its freedom, but we are not complacent. Because we know that, in many countries, the majority of people have yet to see the economic benefits that a free society is supposed to generate. And that many new democracies are threatened by ethnic divisions, rising crime and weak institutions.

It is by now a truism that what is most important is not a country's first election, but rather its second and third. And what matters is not simply that people have the right to vote, but that they are offered a real choice, under conditions that are truly free and fair.

Elections, moreover, are but one essential part of democracy. Others include markets that reward initiative; police that respect due process; legal structures that provide justice; labor organizations that are independent; and a press corps that is free to pursue the facts and publish the truth.

These institutions do not arise overnight. Building democracy takes many years and much patience. It requires not only the seeds of democratic ideals, but also the soil of democratic culture in which those seeds may take root and grow. That is why the United States is working within global and regional institutions to strengthen the commitment to democratic principles and assist governments that practice them.

I am proud of the help that USAID, the State Department and other U.S. agencies are providing to nations in transition. From Asia to Africa to the Andes, they are training judges, drafting commercial codes, advancing the status of women, bolstering civil society and otherwise helping to assemble the nuts and bolts of freedom. I am pleased that in this work, we have partners such as the European Union, Japan, and a host of nongovernmental and private sector organizations that are committed to making the new century a time of freedom and growth.

Our task this year is to renew democratic momentum, not out of altruism, but because democratic growth is part of the answer to many of the economic, political and military challenges that we face.

In Colombia, we have an urgent and obvious stake in aiding President Pastrana's plan to rescue his country and thereby help to rescue ours from the scourge of cocaine.

Nigeria's future development will determine whether it is a source of chaos and corruption or a driving force for stability and progress throughout West Africa.

Indonesia has long been a leader in Southeast Asia. It now has a chance, although under severe stress, to become a model of multi-ethnic democracy, as well.

Aside from Russia, Ukraine is the largest and most influential of the new independent states. And for the first time since independence, it now has a president, a prime minister, and a parliament who support both one another and accelerated reforms.

Later today, I will leave for Kiev, where I will meet with President Kuchma and other senior leaders. I will bring with me a firm message of American support for a strong and independent Ukraine, and for continued progress towards a fuller and richer democracy based on the rule of law.

The President's budget proposes significant investments in each of these four key democracies and in promoting democratic practices and values worldwide. Support for freedom is in the proudest of American traditions from Washington and Jefferson, to Reagan and Clinton. I ask your help in getting a good start on what I hope will be known, with a small "d" as the democratic century.

We complement our support for democratic growth by promoting increased respect for human rights, and by contributing to the global system of international humanitarian response. Americans may be proud of the assistance we provided through defense and foreign operations accounts to help rescue and assist those victimized by the recent devastating floods in southeast Africa, especially Mozambique. Almost half a million people were either trapped by the high waters, or completely lost their homes.

To date, the United States has provided \$10 million in international disaster assistance and \$7 million in food aid. The Defense Department has also been authorized to allocate \$37.6 million in drawdown authority.

Unfortunately, recovery efforts have only begun, the risk of water-borne disease is severe, and substantial additional resources will be needed. The floods have undone much of the economic progress achieved in Mozambique since the civil war there ended eight years ago. Accordingly, we will be consulting with you soon about reprogramming roughly \$32 million from existing resources. And we will be coming forward with a request for \$200 million in emergency supplemental funds.

Americans may also be proud of the State Department's support for human rights. We report annually on human rights and religious freedom in nations around the world. We help support work of the U.N. Human Rights Commission and the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights. We do all we can to shine the spotlight of world attention on places such as Burma and Cuba, where courageous democratic voices are suppressed and unrepresentative governments have led their societies to ruin. And we are the strongest backers of the international war crimes tribunals for Rwanda and the Balkans.

Especially in recent years, the United States has emphasized advancing the status of women and girls economically, and protecting their civil and political rights. These efforts include initiatives to recognize the special needs of women refugees, and to end trafficking in human beings.

The United States has also taken the lead in a global effort to ban the worst forms of child labor, and to establish core standards to prevent the exploitation of workers overseas, while giving American workers a more level playing field on which to compete.

Moreover, I believe that our citizens are proud to support our contributions to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Food Program and other agencies and programs that provide desperately needed assistance and save many human lives. We save lives, as well, by our leadership in global humanitarian demining. Our goal is to eliminate the threat posed by landmines to civilians everywhere by the end of this new decade. In order to reach that goal, we are helping some 30 countries to map and clear their most dangerous minefields, train local deminers, and teach children and adults how to identify and avoid mines. And through the Leahy War Victims Fund, we are working to assist and counsel landmine survivors in more than a dozen countries.

One of our country's most successful overseas programs is the Peace Corps. It brings skills and knowledge to those in need while creating a huge reservoir of goodwill for America. President Clinton is requesting \$275 million for the Peace Corps in FY2001, an increase of \$30 million over the FY2000 enacted level. This would keep the Corps on the path to having 10,000 volunteers serving overseas by 2003.

The bill for all of the programs and initiatives I have described, plus many more I have not had time to describe, adds up to roughly one penny for every dollar the Federal Government spends.

But that single penny can spell the difference between hard times and good times for our people, war and peace for our country, less and more freedom for our world.

The annual budget debate in Washington typically revolves around issues that relate to the role of the federal government in such matters as education and health care. But since the days of Thomas Jefferson, the protection of our national security has been one of the federal government's most basic tasks.

There can be no dispute about this. The need to defend and represent America as a whole is what first brought our nation together. It is a centerpiece of our Constitution. And it is a responsibility that cannot be delegated, subcontracted, privatized or left for others to do. It is the solemn responsibility of the Executive and Legislative branches in Washington, each according to its role.

I know that members of this subcommittee understand this. And I hope you will agree that American diplomacy belongs on the short list of budget priorities for the year 2001.

There are no final frontiers for America. We are not and have never been a status quo country. We are doers.

In the days ahead, we have the chance to add another proud chapter in the history of American leadership, in search of peace, in defense of freedom, on behalf of prosperity, and in service to our collective boss, the American people. I have no doubt that if we are united in that quest, we will succeed.